DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 838 HE 018 887

AUTHOR	Laughlin, Margaret A.
TITLE	An Emerging Institution: The University for Peace in Costa Rica. Discussion Paper Series, No. 73.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Milwaukee. Center for Latin America.
PUB DATE	31 Aug 85
NOTE	34p.
AVAILABLE FROM	University of Wisconsin, Center for Latin America, P.O. Box 413, Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI 53201.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Role; Decision Making; *Educational Development; Educational Planning; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; *International Organizations; International Relations; Networks; *Peace; Program Development; Universities; *World Problems
IDENTIFIERS	New Colleges; *United Nations; *University for Peace (Costa Rica)

ABSTRACT

A new United Nations college, the University for Peace in Costa Rica, is discussed. After providing a brief historical sketch on peace efforts since the Ancient Greeks, the objectives of the United Nations University are identified. The University for Peace is a new international university that is part of the United Nations University network, a decentralized system of affiliated institutions. Costa Rican President Rodrigo Carazo proposed the establishment of the university to the United Nations, which took into consideration the recommendations of United Nations-affiliated bodies, as well as the comments of 10 nations. The following long-range goals for the university were suggested by the United Nations presidential commission: to seek solutions to psychosocial and natural problems that provoke tension, violence, and war in the world; and to contribute content and forms that may be useful in achieving world peace through education, knowledge, and research. Seven topics for interdisciplinary study and research were also suggested, including peace education, human rights, communications, and scientific and technology transfer. Also considered were: recommendations related to university purpose and structure, relationships with other United Nations bodies, and steps to put the university in operation. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED263838

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Margaret A. Laughlin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

AN EMERGING INSTITUTION: THE UNIVERSITY FOR PEACE IN COSTA RICA

By

Margaret A. Laughlin

Discussion Paper No. 73
August 31, 1985

AN EMERGING INSTITUTION: THE UNIVERSITY FOR PEACE IN COSTA RICA

by

Margaret A. Laughlin

Department of Education
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

AN EMERGING INSTITUTION: THE UNIVERSITY FOR PEACE IN COSTA RICA [1]

Margaret A. Laughlin
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

> If you desire peace, prepare for peace. The University for Peace must be the laboratory of the spirit of peace, the crucible in which we must form the new mentality of peace over the decades to come. For the twenty-first century shall be peaceful, or it shall not be.
>
> -- Rodrigo Carazo

The idea of an international organization to preserve and promote peace is not new. Since peace is not a natural condition of society, people throughout history, from the earliest times to the present, have envisioned permanent world peace and unity. Designs of varying magnitude have been formulated in an effort to achieve peace by reducing prejudice and abolishing violence, aggression, and conflict which contributes to the outbreak of war. Some of these proposed peace plans were premature and reflected a prophetic vision, while others were devoid of direct relation to existing circumstances or ignored practical, political, and economic realities. Worldwide universal cooperation leading to world peace became and remains a goal yet to be achieved by humankind.

Early peace plans were fairly rigid, simple in conception, and focused on the concept of aggrandizement of a single head, e.g., Henry IV's Grand Design. Later, Erasmus made a distinction between a just and unjust war. With the continuing growth of nation-states, peace advocates encouraged the organization of federations as means to ensure peace. Subsequent peace plans were more practical, detailed, flexible and allowed for amendment.

While building systems of alliances in order to maintain a balance of power and encouraging a system of conferences and consultations, nations

continued to rely on mediation and arbitration to settle disputes. However, arbitration was in fact rarely used in the sixteenth, seventeenth, or eighteenth centuries to settle disputes peacefully. Mediation was preferred since it provided the opportunity for neutral intervention as a means of reconciling conflicts without diminishing sovereignty. Arbitration was viewed as too threatening to national honor.

The nineteenth century brought about a greater reliance on the arbitration process as a means to settle disputes. Numerous nineteenth century treaties included provisions for arbitration which would lead to the peaceful settlement of disputes. Arbitration efforts failed to prevent wars, but the principle of arbitration was not at fault; rather the application of that principle was not fully put into effect.[2] Efforts to promote, achieve, and maintain peace during the Twentieth Century have attempted to use mediation, arbitration, and moral suasion as articulated through various international bodies. Peace still remains an elusive dream.

Background for Peace Efforts

Human beings do not lightly change their behavior patterns or create new institutions. Humans are creatures of habit, attached to the status quo. Change comes when the inadequacy of existing institutions and/or circumstances becomes apparent.

Humankind is indebted to the ancient Greeks for developing the concept of a peace confederation based on mutual cooperation. The Greeks also utilized arbitration as a peaceful way to settle disputes.[3] Later the Pax Romana achieved an enforced national peace as Rome dominated the world and recognized no equals. With the decline of the Roman Empire

political peace was impossible to maintain. With the coming of the Middle Ages, Christian Europe turned to the papacy, which became the supreme arbitrator in Europe. The pope promoted the idea of unity of civilization but was unable to achieve long-term peace and stability. Rising nationalism, supplemented by growing economic interdependence, however, gave birth to the creation of sovereign states who sought to determine their own conduct and obligations. Reason gave way to force as claims to power were manifest within and among states.[4]

By the nineteenth century developing nationalism was manifest in the struggle for national existence and unity.[5] Relations among nations and international politics tended to center on the threat of war although systems of alliances to achieve a balance of power were established to prevent war and maintain peace. Economic expansion, imperialism, and militarism were based on national self-interest. International antagonisms led to wars which were fought primarily to maintain or achieve national security. For example, in nations with a population of a half million or more, between 1816 and 1965 peace existed for only 24 of those 150 years.[6] During the quarter century following World War II, there has been an average of over twenty internal, regional, or international conflicts per year within or among nations of all sizes.[7] International tensions today remain self-evident and perhaps reflect the failure of many to adjust their attitudes to the prevailing and growing interdependence of nations. A reading of the daily press or viewing of evening news on television vividly portrays bloodshed and violence which reflect a lack of peace throughout the world.

Despite such antagonisms there has existed evidence of developing bonds of unity and cooperation among individuals and nations. For example, the

Industrial Revolution brought about economic interdependence among nations; telephone, telegraph, and railroad tracks were established, allowing the crossing of national borders to facilitate communication; researchers and scientists recognized the mutual benefit of the exchange of scholarly information through publications and attendance at international meetings in order to disseminate new findings and to reduce duplication of scholarly research activities. By the beginning of the twentieth century, numerous professional international congresses, associations, and societies in the arts, sciences, and education had been established. Soon it became a practical necessity for governments to establish unions for international action in order to deal with problems arising from the developing communication technology of a new century. International organizations of various sizes and with different purposes were organized. Directly or indirectly, these organizations would promote international cooperation and help to reduce areas of potential tension, conflict, and violence among nations.

To a large extent such international cooperation was interrupted by World War I. At the conclusion of World War I, many people felt the time was right to initiate changes in order to secure and to maintain peace. To that end, the Allies established the League of Nations to provide a sense of national direction and control of international events for the benefit of the world. Within the structure of the League, the Committee on Intellectual Cooperation was established to promote an intellectual exchange of knowledge and experience among scholars and researchers. During the 1920s several important proposals to establish an international university in order to promote intellectual cooperation and to reduce the threat of conflict were presented to the members of this committee.[8] One underlying intent of many

of these proposals was to promote international understanding and thereby promote peace among individuals and nations.

With several competing proposals to establish an international university before it, the Committee took no action to support international higher education in general, and specifically took no action to establish an international university. Committee members determined there were too many insurmountable obstacles to the establishment of an international university at that time. It seems evident that during the 1920s international rivalries and national jealousies were stronger than the desire for the intellectual cooperation needed to achieve peace.[9]

Following World War II, the Allies established the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which at the time placed a higher priority on primary and secondary basic education than on higher education and the possible establishment of an international university. During the next 25 years, however, national and international public agencies and private groups initiated numerous educational activities which promoted the ideals of the United Nations Charter, the Declaration of Human Rights, and of peace education and peace research.[10]

In 1969 United Nations Secretary-General U Thant proposed to the United Nations General Assembly the establishment of a university which would be "international in character and devoted to the Charter objectives of peace and progress."[11] The university would have as its primary obligation the promotion of "international understanding both at the political and cultural levels." According to Thant, the university would be staffed with faculty and include students from many countries and cultures who would live and work

together in an international atmosphere conducive to promoting international understanding and cooperation.[12]

Following feasibility studies, acrimonious debate, and inter-agency discussions, the original concept was significantly changed from that of a degree-granting institution to a world-wide network of advanced study institutions which would focus on post-graduate training, research, and the dissemination of knowledge. The General Assembly established United Nations University in 1972 and approved its charter the following year.

According to its charter, United Nations University is to seek solutions to problems which heretofore have defied solution by a single nation.[13] United Nations University is to be funded by voluntary contributions to an endowment fund established outside the United Nations' regular budget contributions. The university, which functions through a central programming and coordinating body located in Tokyo, is charged with the responsibility of establishing a series of networks and contractual relationships among existing universities, research centers, institutes, and the like, in order to seek solutions to the several priority problem areas identified by the United Nations University Council. Initial topics for research included world hunger, human and social development, and the use and management of natural resources. Research reports prepared by the first United Nations University fellows (scholars) and researchers are now becoming available. As with any new institution, program priorities change, and new programs for greater effectiveness are being planned. Based on their current five-year plan of action, United Nations University will focus its research on studies related to:

(a) peace, security, conflict resolution and global transformation;

(b) the global economy;

(c) hunger, poverty, resources and the environment;

(d) human and social development and the co-existence of peoples, cultures and social systems; and

(e) science, technology and their social and ethical implications.[14]

These programs will be examined horizontally across disciplines (in relation to theme) and vertically at the local, national, and international levels. Information based on this research will be disseminated widely to members of the academic community, policy makers, and others interested in the research findings. To date, research focusing on peace per se has not been initiated by United Nations University.

In light of such past efforts and experiences, a new international university focusing specifically on world peace has been proposed to and formally established by the United Nations as the University for Peace in Costa Rica. In the next section of the paper, I will discuss this initiative, now in its genesis, the goals of which are to encourage world peace by promoting "the spirit of understanding, tolerance, and peaceful coexistence to stimulate cooperation among peoples and help lessen obstacles and threats to world peace and progress."[15] The future of this new international university is not clear at present, but educators and peace-seeking people should be aware of this model as an international institution designed and organized to promote world peace.

The University for Peace: A Vision to Reality

In his address to the United Nations General Assembly in 1978, Rodrigo Carazo, President of Costa Rica, proposed that the United Nations establish

a University for Peace within the framework of the existing United Nations University network, which is a "decentralized system of affiliated institutions integrated into the world university community."[16] According to Carazo, the proposed university would be a center of higher learning open to all people of good will. The university would have as its primary objective

> to contribute through research, teaching, dissemination and free inquiry, to the cause of peace, to mutual knowledge for men throughout the world, and the promotion among all men of a spirit of understanding, tolerance, and peaceful coexistence in order to stimulate international cooperation and eliminate any situation which would imperil universal peace and the progress of peoples.[17]

President Carazo indicated that his country would be pleased to serve as host for the new institution by providing the headquarters and granting it the privileges and attributes of such an international organization. He also offered to provide the United Nations with architectural drawings and preliminary financial plans and suggested several possible programs for consideration by the members of the United Nations. The proposed land site had been donated to the government of Costa Rica by the late Costa Rican philanthropist Cruz Rojar Bennet, who had conserved this forest land, considered to be priceless and unique in Central America. One hundred hectares was to be set aside for the campus itself, with the remaining land to be preserved as virgin forest. The site was viewed as "ample and ideal from ecological and geographical points of view." The physical and biological climates would provide an environment conducive to study and research which would contribute to peace in the world.[18]

Following United Nations rules of procedure for consideration of such matters, the proposal was referred to the United Nations Second Committee dealing with economic and financial questions for further review and

discussion. During the discussion, the Costa Rican representative made it clear that while Costa Rica assumed responsibility for setting up the University for Peace, the University was offered to the United Nations for the benefit of the peoples of the world. The new university was not intended to compete with existing institutions of higher education. Most of the discussion focused primarily on the possible relationship of the proposed university and United Nations University and its established research networks and funding sources. The discussants noted that the United Nations University was continuing to experience major difficulties in securing needed operational funds and recommended that great care be taken with respect to fund raising for the proposed University for Peace.

The General Assembly did approve Resolution 33/109 (1978) and requested that Kurt Waldheim, the United Nations Secretary-General, seek comments and reactions from the Rector of the United Nations University, James Hester, and from UNESCO officials, United Nations member states, and other United Nations agencies and organizations, as appropriate. The secretary-general was instructed to report these findings to the General Assembly at its session the following year.[19]

UNESCO, a specialized United Nations agency designed to encourage nations to share their scholarly and educational resources, has the responsibility to advise the United Nations on educational, scientific, and cultural matters. Its constitution, which declares that wars begin in the minds of men, recommends that the defenses of peace should also be erected in the minds of men. UNESCO members recognize that education should do its utmost to foster love of peace and promote mutual understanding among the peoples of the world. This role has been taken seriously, and UNESCO is

determined to exercise this responsibility by speaking out forcefully on these matters.

The UNESCO Executive Board indicated subsequently that the Costa Rican proposal was of "considerable importance, praiseworthy, and merited unreserved moral support."[20] At the same time, UNESCO indicated that the aims, objectives, and functions of United Nations University were to be taken into account when considering the institutional model, structure, and spheres of competency for the proposed new university.

In order to avoid unnecessary duplication of programmatic and research efforts with existing bodies, UNESCO recommended that the action themes identified by each university be compatible and complementary. The UNESCO Executive Board also indicated that, according to its constitution, UNESCO had numerous "programme activities concerning peace and education for international understanding, cooperation and peace, human rights, the transfer of science and technology, natural resources and communication."[21] The need to secure adequate financial resources without diverting "necessary material, human and intellectual resources from the United Nations University" was enunciated. The UNESCO Executive Board had articulated its concerns very clearly. In addition, the Executive Board noted that within UNESCO's limited resources, its officials would be available to offer consultant services and to draw on the organization's past experiences and contacts to help the proposed new institution and information center which the Executive Board presumed would have a direct relationship with UNESCO.[22]

In June 1979, the Costa Rican vice president, José Miguel Alfaro-Rodríguez, traveled to Tokyo to address the Council for United Nations University. He outlined the various arrangements needed to establish and

maintain the proposed University for Peace. He stressed the need for the United Nations University Council members to examine various possible relationships which could be implemented between the two international universities. The vice president indicated that his government had the necessary means to obtain the resources needed to establish and maintain the proposed university. He clearly stated that the members of the United Nations University Council would be responsible for determining whether the proposed University for Peace met the established criteria to become one of the associated institutions within the United Nations University network system.

The United Nations University Council responded by noting it could not determine how the proposed University for Peace would fit into the United Nations University System of networks since the precise structure and program of the University for Peace had not yet been formulated. However, the council members indicated that at a later date they would be willing to consider including the University for Peace as an autonomous body and associated institution if the program for the proposed University for Peace contributed to the continuing efforts of the United Nations University research network, which then consisted of 23 associated institutions and over 80 research and training units worldwide. In addition, the council stressed that plans for financing the University for Peace must not divert already scarce resources from the United Nations University, which is still in great need of financial support.[23]

Ten nations responded to the verbale request of the secretary-general to comment on the proposal for a University for Peace.[24] The responses indicated varying degrees of support for the proposed venture. At the same

time, there were expressions of genuine concern, due in part to the very general nature of the General Assembly resolution and lack of sufficient information available related to (1) establishing a University for Peace within the existing United Nations University network; (2) possible duplication of efforts with other United Nations agencies and programs, thereby reducing the effectiveness of the work of such agencies and programs; and (3) potential financial difficulties related to voluntary or outside funding needed to operate the new university.[25] This third concern was especially critical since United Nations member states were already facing mild to severe budgetary constraints due to world economic conditions and were not in a position to divert already scarce funds to a new international body. The magnitude of the funds needed to ensure a successful operation of the university clearly required careful attention and discussion by all concerned.

Other United Nations agencies also commented on the proposal. Officials from United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) described the proposal as "an inviting one, deserving encouragement and support." They noted that based on past experiences similar organizations had found it difficult to secure adequate funding in order to function effectively. The United Nations Center for Disarmament suggested that the University for Peace might be useful in transmitting "information on disarmament and on the underlying problems of the arms race."[26] Both agencies indicated that there seemed to be general support for the idea to establish a University for Peace.[27]

In the meantime, the Costa Rican government organized a Presidential Commission of the University for Peace to coordinate decisions and activities to establish the university (Executive Decree 9596 RE).[28] Such tasks included developing an academic plan and internal structure securing promises of funding from within Costa Rica and from international sources, and obtaining support for the project from United Nations member states and other

international organizations. These included public and private institutions, organizations and groups which specialize in education and research efforts related to peace. These efforts by the Costa Rican government were to be considered as a basis for further continued discussion, analysis, and elaboration, rather than to be considered as a final proposal.

The Presidential Commission suggested the following possible long range goals for the University:

(1) To seek solutions to psychosocial and natural problems which provoke tension, aggression, violence, and war in the world

(2) To contribute content and forms which may be useful in achieving world peace through education information, knowledge and research.

Based on concerns voiced by different international organizations during the Decade of Disarmament, seven topics which lend themselves to interdisciplinary study and research were suggested by the commission as possible areas of academic focus. These seven topics include:

(1) irenology, the science of peace;

(2) peace education or the pedagogy of peace in order to develop a theoretical framework, appropriate instruments, and methods of education for world peace

(3) human rights to find answers to the numerous national and international problems related to this area of conflict and confrontation

(4) communications as a contributor to conflict and war by those directly involved in the conflict and indirectly by observers of the conflict

(5) scientific and technology transfer, which creates tensions between the haves and the have-nots

(6) natural resources and the quality of life which would seek to promote better land use, new forms and sources of food, study

non-conventional sources of energy, etc.; and

(7) peace and conflict viewed from a global perspective.

To gain Costa Rica's perspective in desiring to establish and host the University for Peace, one might consider Costa Rica's first constitution after independence in 1821. The Pacto de Concordia reflects Costa Rica's desire to avoid tension and conflict and to live in peace with its neighbors as a newly independent nation. Costa Ricans hold peace in high regard and hackles rise when any movement toward militarism develops. According to a recent study of national character, Costa Ricans have a strong sense of individual liberty and hold freedom in high regard.[29] Several times throughout its history Costa Rica has appealed to international bodies to take an active role in the resolution of conflict through the use of established international frameworks, treaties, and agreements. The current Costa Rican constitution prohibits establishing the army as a permanent institution. In the event that military force is needed for national defense, the military is by law subordinate to civilian authority. Costa Rica, like other nations, prefers peace to conflict.

A strong commitment to education has been of major importance to Costa Rica. Public education is viewed as an integrated process, and academic freedom is guaranteed. As early as 1869 Costa Rica established free, compulsory primary and tax-supported elementary education for both girls and boys.

Education through the ninth year is compulsory for all who entered school since 1973. Today approximately 30% of Costa Rica's annual budget, or 9% of the GNP, is spent on education. The current literacy rate of 93% is boasted to be the highest in Central America.[30] (These figures have been challenged by the minister of education, however.)

Costa Rica was slow to be colonized and served as a crossroads area which historically promoted cultural encounters for three Indian cultures:

Maya, Aztec, and Chibcha. Later the arrival of Spanish, other Europeans, Chinese, and Black immigrants all helped to shape a people and culture which is receptive to new arrivals.[31] Costa Rica is essentially an integrated nation. The political, economic, and cultural environments are conducive to educational development, which in turn reinforces other aspects of Costa Rican life.

Based on its tradition of being an open society and a stable democracy, Costa Rica views itself as being in an excellent position to welcome researchers, professors, scholars, and students with varying traditions and cultures from around the world. Those at the university would have ample opportunity to engage in direct exchange of information, experience and culture. By creating such an intellectual environment, Costa Rica is hopeful that it can contribute to the attainment of world peace.

After receiving a sense of support from the United Nations members, organizations, and agencies for the Costa Rican proposal, the United Nations General Assembly approved the establishment of a University for Peace as an autonomous body and international center for higher post-graduate studies, research, and the dissemination of knowledge related to training for peace. This decision carried some moral weight. The secretary-general was entrusted with the task of constituting a Commission on the University for Peace responsible for initial planning. (See Appendix A for a list of commission members.) According to the General Assembly action the new University should be:

(1) International in character and should be a part of the United Nations University system network which would be determined by common agreement between the two international institutions

(2) Structured in such a way as not to duplicate similar institutions and their work

(3) Should be financed by voluntary contributions and not have budget implications for either the United Nations or the United Nations University.[32]

The International Commission on the University for Peace met twice during 1980, once in June in New York and again in September in Costa Rica. While many important topics were considered by the commission members, for ease of discussion they will be divided into three categories:

(1) Recommendations related to purpose, structure, duplication of effort, finance, and sites

(2) Special relationships with other United nations related bodies

(3) Needed steps to set the university in motion.[33]

Commission members were very much aware of acute and continuing international stress, persistence of war, and mounting threats against peace throughout the world. On the average, a new military conflict had broken out every three months worldwide since World War II and there is a nuclear arsenal capable of destroying eight times the present global population. They were also cognizant of the fact that in 1979 governments throughout the world spent in excess of $450 billion on arms but only $400 billion on education. A nagging question facing the commission centered on how much of the money spent on education had been "devoted to peace -- building in mental structures as a defense against the folly of the latter." They believed that

> peace would not be ensured only through education and research, because peace was chiefly threatened by social justice, inequitable economic distribution, intolerance, cultural aggression, political arrogance and contempt for human dignity, among other reasons. Those very causes need to be analyzed, studied and taught to increase popular awareness of them.[34]

The University for Peace, when established, will be unique in that its epistemological axis will be peace education for peace, human rights, and the awakening public opinion to the problems of peace. It will offer instruction and promote research efforts on these topics at the graduate level, and the

university will offer advance degrees at both the master's and doctoral level.

Research undertaken at the university would be both theoretical and applied and would attempt to achieve both a conceptual and operational idea of peace. These efforts could lead to new frontiers in international law and promote peace, international solidarity, interdependence, and shared responsibility among nations and people. The university has the potential to define new rights and to promote existing rights. It can also "investigate the role of violence in ideologies and the role of ideologies or social models in built-in violence and conflicts arising from convergence of circumstances."[35]

Since the idea of peace is an overarching one, teaching, training, and research will have to be multidisciplinary and utilize the wisdom accumulated from various cultures and traditions throughout the world. It will be necessary to develop a "proper dialectic" between ongoing research and the need for action between those who teach and are taught, and between science and practical living. It was expected that less emphasis would be placed on formal lectures and that more emphasis would be on "practical work, guided projects, surveys, and exchanges between various social groups," since many of its activities would be designed for people outside the university.[36] Somewhat conventional topics which have direct or indirect effect on peace, e.g., the environment, natural resource development, technology, transnational corporations, etc., would be examined in relation to their impact on peace. Focus areas for teaching and research will require ongoing adjustments in light of research completed or in light of new and developing problems or concerns influencing peace.

> The purpose of the university is to assist in bringing about changes in national and international life by promoting better understanding between individuals, groups, and countries. Stress would be placed on similarities rather than differences. Efforts would be made to distinguish between struggles which are necessary for the sake of human survival and those which are destructive and inhuman.[37]

Dissemination of the knowledge gained at the university is viewed as essential in order to promote peace.

In terms of structure, the commission members decided not to recommend a specific organizational plan since the university was to be autonomous and would enjoy full academic freedom. The members believed it was within the purview of university officials to determine course content. They suggested that rigid boundaries of "traditional departments" be avoided in order to allow for an examination of topics from a perspective of several disciplines, traditions, cultures, and ideologies. They did recommend that an International Peace Data and Information Center (CEDIPAZ) be established and developed in close cooperative relations with UNESCO so as to be able to identify, evaluate, and disseminate updated data related to peace. They also suggested that fruitful collaborative efforts might be established with the Institute of Human Rights, already existing in Costa Rica. Flexibility, decentralized organization, and sound management of university programs would enable the university to expand at its own rate, yet remain sensitive to emerging world trends and issues, and attain its goals and objectives.

Earlier discussions within various United Nations organizations and among United Nations member states forcefully emphasized that the University for Peace should not duplicate but work to complement similar efforts underway by other international bodies. The commission concluded that the existence of other international bodies with peace objectives did not necessarily mean a duplication of responsibility in as much as a wide range of tasks were involved. They noted that the focus and priority of similar peace objectives may vary widely from body to body.

As far as precise activities were concerned, the commission members made a clear distinction between replication and duplication. To the Commission the reproduction of research activities was wasteful, unnecessary, and should

be resisted. The commission indicated that the use of different approaches and methodologies to seek solutions to broad problems would be welcomed, especially if the research effort was innovative and held promise to break new ground. Clearly the university should be charged not to ignore existing research and the ongoing work of others, but at the same time the university "should not be inhibited by the presence of others similarly engaged elsewhere: it should merely join forces with them."[38]

With declining economic resources and increasing competition for already scarce funds, the financial base of the new university required careful attention and scrutiny. The initial cost of the university was estimated to be $14 million for the first three years of operation. Subsequent costs have not yet been determined. The government of Costa Rica estimated it would have already spent $1 million on the project through 1980. It was prepared to contribute money for initial construction and the building of an access road to the campus at a cost of approximately $3 million. The government was now ready to donate 300 hectares of land for the university with 100 hectares for the campus facilities with the remaining land to remain as virgin forest and be reserved for the study of ecology. The site, facilities, and buildings would be turned over to the autonomous university and the role of the government of Costa Rica, if it was to have one, would be determined by the university governing body. The new university was supported by the existing institutions of higher education in Costa Rica. It is expected construction of the campus will proceed in several stages and that within ten years the university will have approximately 2000 students along with the corresponding academic administration, faculty, and support staff.

The Costa Rican vice president indicated that discussions had been initiated with eight other countries and that $5.5 million would be available each year for the operation of the university. The money, earmarked for the

university, would be from a "contribution of $0.10 per barrel of oil purchased by the beneficiaries of the petroleum agreements" signed by José Lopéz Portillo, President of Mexico, and Luis Herrera Campins, President of Venezuela. The agreement guarantees "beneficiary countries a supply of oil and provides for a 30 percent credit on the oil bill."[39] The agreement was considered to be a "gesture of solidarity" and a precedent for other governments to take which would lead to a "new international economic order." It also represents a "new type of international cooperation" whereby the importing countries will be able to import oil under terms beneficial to their own development. This arrangement, however, did not preclude the university from securing other sources of financing from private or public sources so long as these fund raising efforts did not divert funds from the United Nations University or have other budget implications for the United Nations or its related agencies.

The nature of the precise relationship of the University for Peace and the United Nations, United Nations University, and other United Nations related organizations needed to be resolved without exceeding the competency of the commission. Since there seemed to be at least two possible types of relations with the United Nations itself, the commission sought clarification from the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs as to the legal and budget implications of each possible arrangement. With this advice in mind, inter alia, commission members recommended that if the General Assembly decided to establish a University for Peace, it should be established in "the terms of an international agreement to be open to signature by all States." The university would function with a charter which could be approved at the same time and be consistent with United Nations and other international principles, procedures and practices. Later the General Assembly accepted this recommendation by passing Resolution 35/55 (1980) to formally establish

the University for Peace.[40]

Recognizing the need to develop and maintain positive relations with UNESCO, the commission noted that several possible collaborative efforts between UNESCO and the University for Peace could include research on such topics as human rights, cultural diversity, education and information covering human rights, peace and international understanding, problems of social disharmony, and the process and role of communication. The commission recommended that additional ways and means be investigated in order to ensure programmatic and institutional collaboration on appropriate topics for the mutual benefit of both organizations. They believed UNESCO's years of experience would be invaluable to the new university.

UNITAR officials had responded favorably to the proposed university. The commission members expressed a conviction that close collaboration should be established to enable the fledgling university to draw on the expertise and accumulated experience of UNITAR's training and research efforts and suggested that both agencies might work together and cooperate on educational matters and research topics of interest to both organizations.

The precise relationship with the United Nations University, however, was another matter and presented potential difficulty. The General Assembly resolution supporting the idea of a University for Peace clearly indicated that the new university should be international in character and should be a part of the United Nations University system and that such linkage should be determined by common agreement between the two international universities. To some, the wording of the United Nations resolution ignored the prerogatives of United Nations University and prejudged the relationship of the new university and United Nations University. This point may prove to be bothersome at some future time as the University for Peace becomes operational. Based on the United Nations University Charter it would appear that the University for

Peace would become an "associated" institution or that some type of contractual arrangement could be developed to include the University for Peace in the United Nations University network of institutions. In any event, until the new university is established it is not possible to determine the exact nature of the relationship of these two international universities. Excessive competition would be detrimental to the work of both institutions.

While recognizing the existence of non-governmental groups and organizations in peace and peace organizations, the commission recommended these be contacted by means of a questionnaire to draw on their experiences and expertise and to reduce the likelihood of duplication of research efforts. In addition, the commission suggested certain points which should be included in a United Nations resolution itself, prepared a draft of an international agreement for signatories, and developed a proposed Charter for the University for Peace. The commission also suggested that they be entrusted to continue to function on behalf of the university until the University Council had been selected and was in place.

Meanwhile, additional support for the University for Peace came from the Inter-Parliamentary Conference, meeting in Berlin. The conference requested that all parliaments and governments give material and moral support related to the "creation and consolidation" of the University for Peace.[41]

On December 5, 1980, the United Nations General Assembly approved the establishment of the University for Peace as an international institution specializing in post-graduate studies, research, and dissemination of knowledge directly related to training for peace. The Agreement for the Establishment of the university became effective on April 7, 1981 when the required "10 States from more than one continent" had signed the Agreement.[42]

Five months later Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim announced the appointment of the University for Peace Council members. The council is the "supreme authority" for the university. These members will serve terms initially for four years and may be reappointed. The council met for its first session in March 1982 in San José, Costa Rica.

At its first meeting the council approved its operating rules of procedures and the Statute of the International Foundation for the University. The Foundation is to serve as a financial supporting body in a capacity independent of the university. Its purpose is to assist the university in meeting the capital or recurrent costs of the endowment of the university. Until the foundation is fully functioning, its various responsibilities will be carried out by the University Council. Council members elected Costa Rican President Rodrigo Carazo as its president by acclamation.

Due to insufficient time during its initial meeting, the Council appointed a curriculum committee charged with the tasks of formulating a series of guidelines and proposals for the curriculum, and establishing a list of institutions engaged in peace research and practice. Several institutions had previously expressed an interest in establishing a working relation with the new university. The university is expected to appoint faculty and select students to ensure world-wide representation in terms of geographic regions, cultural traditions, social and economic systems, age, and sex.

Related to financing the university, Carazo informed the Council that on the previous day the government of Costa Rica had created the Mexico-Venezuela Foundation for the University for Peace. The foundation was established to receive the income from investments based on a 20 percent per barrel surcharge as agreed on by the Mexican and Venezuelan presidents in 1980. This income would be applied to meet both capital and recurrent expenses of the

university. Carazo also indicated that other governments had given indications of contributing financial and other support. Several non-governmental organizations expressed a sustained interest in the new university. Other interested foundations, groups and private individuals have also expressed a willingness to assist the university.[43]

Between the first and second council meetings organizational work continued. For example, several new members were added to the council, the Headquarters Agreement between the government of Costa Rica and the University for Peace was negotiated, giving the university the same advantages and prerogatives granted to the United Nations by the Costa Rican government. In conjunction, plans were made with United Nations University to hold a joint seminar on "Development, Inequality and Race" in cooperation with the Colegio de México in 1983 or 1984. Work also continued on the basic elements of program and curriculum planning under the leadership of Betty Reardon of Columbia University.

At the second council meeting, members agreed that Carazo should perform the duties of the rector for the following year while the search for a permanent rector continues. In addition, the University for Peace plans to publish a newsletter to help people become informed about the university, its goals and functions. It should be noted that modest funding has been received from several governments. Unfortunately, at present this funding is inadequate to meet the needs of the university and more time is required in order to achieve the financial security necessary for the university to function and to fulfill its mission.[44]

Quite clearly a number of important steps have already been made to enable the University for Peace to become a force for peace in the world. As Carazo has stated so clearly:

> If you desire peace, prepare for peace. The University for Peace must be the laboratory of the spirit of peace, the crucible in which we must form the new mentality of peace over the decades to come. For the twenty-first century shall be peaceful, or it shall not be.[45]

Looking to the future

The new international university is obviously in its initial stage of operation, and its future direction remains uncertain. Let me suggest several areas of uncertainty in need of clarification in order to allow the University for Peace to reach its potential.

First, policy decisions and functional responsibilities regarding administration and management, program priorities, curricula, faculty and staff recruitment, research topics, dissemination, etc., need to be made in light of responsibilities assigned to and/or to be assumed by the university. In particular, a precise working relationship with the United Nations University needs to be formulated in the not too distant future, especially if any future activities of United Nations University reflect the theme of "international peace, security and global transformation." Close cooperation should be developed between the University for Peace and UNESCO, UNITAR, and other similar agencies which have responsibilities in the field of education and/or an interest in peace.

At the same time, in order to promote its goals and objectives, the university should consider establishing varying arrangements with research, educational, and training institutes, governmental agencies, regional organizations, private groups, professional associations, and individuals. The university should promote exchanges of scholars, ideas, and information by sponsoring conferences, workshops, and seminars. It can also serve as a valuable depository of information and materials related to peace, peace education, peace research and peace scholars.

Second, the availability of financial resources will determine the future growth and rate of development of the university. Given current worldwide economic conditions it is important not to underestimate the potential financial difficulties which may arise in relation to establishing the university. With the world oil glut, declining oil prices, and diminishing economic resources, funding seems to be a particularly critical concern since great expectations were placed on funding through the sale of oil. Both long term and short range in-depth planning becomes imperative to determine initial costs, operating expenses, and funding sources in order to secure a sound financial base. Without an adequate base of support the university is not likely to be a viable institution and will be unable to attract high quality faculty, researchers, and students in the immediate future.

Third, the university must remain flexible in selecting topics, focus, and settings for research, and use periodic self-evaluation as a tool for future planning. Both long term and short term projects need to be identified and prioritized. These projects should be implemented as resources are available.

Fourth, the rights and duties of states which signed the International Agreement to Establish the University for Peace must be clarified, as well as the status of states which are not yet parties to the Agreement. This issue seems to be of critical importance to various members of the UNESCO Executive Board.[46]

The concept of having a University for Peace is now a reality and its future holds promise. A great opportunity lies ahead. It is important for the university to establish its credibility as an international autonomous agency independent of conflicting political and economic idealogies. To accomplish its goals, tangible financial support from several nations and foundations is needed. If the University for Peace is to become effective

in helping to achieve world peace, large scale international cooperation is vital. Its future rests to a large extent on the results it obtains during the early years of its existence.

As a new institution within the United Nations structure, the University for Peace requires close observation and careful analysis. Perhaps the new institution will be the catalyst to create the conditions needed for world peace. It is but one tangible expression of international cooperation in intellectual matters in order to help achieve conditions ripe for world peace.

NOTES

1. Earlier versions of this paper were presented to the North Central Council of Latin Americanists meeting, October 1982 and to the Comparative and International Education Society meeting, March 1983, and to the Education in Latin America Conference sponsored by Tulane University, April 1983.

2. Hemleben, Sylvester J.- Plans for World Peace Through Six Centuries, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1972.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Reinsch, Paul S. - "Public International Unions," Search for Peace, A Reader in International Relations, David Brook, editor. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1970.

6. Singer, J. David and Melvin Small - The Wages of War, 1816-1965, New York: Wiley, 1972, pp. 201, 379.

7. Azar, Edward E. - Probe for Peace, Minneapolis: Burgess, 1973, p. 3.

8. Laughlin, Margaret A. - United Nations University: From Concept to Implementation, unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1978.

9. Ibid.

10. Zweig, Michael - The Idea of A World University, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967.

11. United Nations General Assembly, "Introduction to the Annual Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization, September 1969." UNGA Official Records, 24th Session, Supplement, No. 1A (A/7601/add.1), par. 196-197, p. 23.

12. Ibid.

13. United Nations University Charter, United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3081 (XXVIII), 6 December 1973.

14. Joint Inspection Unit. Training and Research: United Nations University, A/37/111, 11 March 1982, par. 81, p. 20.

15. Commission of the University for Peace. Report of the Commission to the Secretary-General, UNESCO Executive Board, 110 EX/43, 29 September 1980, Annex II, par. (vi), p. 1.

16. Carazo, Rodrigo - Address to the United Nations General Assembly in General Debate, 27 December 1978. Official Records of the General Assembly, 33rd Session, Plenary Meetings, Vol. I., Verbatim Records of the 1st to 34th meetings, 19 September - 13 October 1978, par. 102-122, p. 158-159.

17. Ibid.

18. Ibid.

19. "Proposal for the Establishment of a University for Peace." Resolutions and Decisions adopted by the General Assembly during its Thirty-Third Session, 87th plenary meeting, 18 December 1978. General Assembly Official Records, 33rd Session, Supplement No. 46 (A/33/46).

20. Commission on the University for Peace. Adoption of the Report of the Commission, United Nations General Assembly document A/AC.203/CRP.7, 15 August 1980, p. 6.

21. United Nations General Assembly, United Nations University Question of the Establishment of a University for Peace Report of the Secretary-General, United Nations document A/34/496, Annex I, p. 3, 1979.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid., p. 5.

24. The ten governments responding with comments to the Secretary-General were Australia, Canada, Cyprus, France, Ghana, Guatemala, Indonesia, Japan, Mauritius and Niger. Ibid., p. 4.

25. Ibid., p. 4.

26. Ibid., p. 6.

27. Ibid., Annex I, par. 10, p. 8.

28. Presidential Commission on the University for Peace. Proposal by the Government of Costa Rica, San Jose, Costa Rica, June 1979.

29. Biesanz, Richard, Karen Biesanz and Mavis H. Biesanz - The Costa Ricans, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982.

30. Ibid, pp. 3-5; Presidential Commission..., p.4.

31. Biesanz, Richard, op.cit.

32. "Establishment of a University for Peace." (Resolution 34/111) Resolutions and Decisions adopted by the General Assembly during its Thirty-Fourth Session 104th plenary meeting, 14 December 1979. General Assembly Official Records, 34th Session, Supplement No. 46 (A/34/46).

33. United Nations General Assembly, Training and Research, University for Peace Report of the Secretary-General, United Nations document A/35/468,1980.

34. Ibid.

35. Commission of the University for Peace. Ibid., Annex I, par. 33, P.11.

36. UNESCO Executive Board. Establishment of a University for Peace, 110 EX/43, 29 September 1980, Annex I, par. 37, p. 12.

37. Ibid., pp. 12-13.

38. Ibid., Annex I, p. 14.

39. Ibid., p. 15.

40. "Establishment of a University for Peace." Resolutions and Decisions adopted by the General Assembly during its Thirty-Fifth Session 83rd plenary meeting, 5 December 1980. General Assembly Official Records, 35th Session, Supplement No. 46 (A/35/46).

41. United Nations General Assembly. Training and Research, University for Peace: Report of the Secretary-General, document A/C.2/35/4, 1980.

42. The initial ten United Nations members signing the International Agreement were Costa Rica, Venezuela, Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Pakistan, Nicaragua, Senegal, and Panama. Correspondence, Francisco Barahona, Executive Secretary, University for Peace to author 27 December 1982. Subsequently, the following United Nations members have signed the International Agreement: Bangladesh, Democratic Kampuchea, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Italy, Mexico, Peru, Spain, Sri Lanka, Surinam, Togo and Cameroon. University for Peace, Costa Rica, December 1982.

43. University for Peace. Report of the Council of the University for Peace, on its First Session, San José, Costa Rica, 6-8 March 1982, University for Peace, Consejo 1/12, 1982.

44. University for Peace. Provisional Report of the Second Period of Sessions (19-20 January 1983), Council UP-C2/25; Correspondence, Betty Reardon, to author 22 February 1983.

45. University for Peace, Costa Rica, 1982.

46. UNESCO Executive Board, Report of the Programme and External Relations Commission, 112 EX/32, 24 June 1981, par. 149, p. 30.

APPENDIX A

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY FOR PEACE

Experts appointed by the United Nations Secretary-General:

Dr. Rafael Caldera (Venezuela)
Professor Mahdi Elmandjra (Morocco)
Professor Joseph Ki Zerbo (Upper Volta)
Mr. Yoshizo Konishi (Japan)
Professor Raúl Morodo (Spain)

Representatives of the Government of Costa Rica:

Mr. José Miguel Alforo-Rodríguez (Vice President)
Mr. Francisco Barahona Riera

Representative of the Secretary-General:

Dr. Zeo Marcella (Assistant Secretary-General for Secretarial Services for Economic and Social Matters)

Representative of the Executive Director of UNESCO:

Mr. J. Balbir

Representative of the Rector of United Nations University:

Mr. A. Kwapong (Vice-Rector)

Representative of the International Academic Community:

Mr. R. Keyes (former Secretary-General of the International Association of Universities)